

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 James T. Rodgers,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV 05-0850 DFL PAN P

12 vs.

13 Greg Steber, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On November 20, 2005, defendant Hendricks filed a motion to dismiss pursuant
17 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b). Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.

18 Local Rule 78-230(m) provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file
19 written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any
20 opposition to the granting of the motion" On August 4, 2005, plaintiff was advised of the
21 requirements for filing an opposition to motions and that failure to oppose a motion may be
22 deemed consent to the relief requested in the motion.

23 Local Rule 11-110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules "may be
24 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
25 inherent power of the Court." In the order filed August 4, 2005, plaintiff was advised

26 /////

1 that failure to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be
2 dismissed.

3 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the
4 date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any he has, to the motion to dismiss or a
5 statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation
6 that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

7 DATED: February 27, 2006.

8
9 
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 7

12 rodg0850.46osc